

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

R & D Film 1, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOES 1-11,

Defendants.

ORDER

13-cv-280-bbc

In this civil lawsuit, plaintiff R & D Film 1, LLC, has alleged that defendants Does 1 - 15 have violated plaintiff's copyright on the motion picture "The Divide. Currently before the court is an anonymous letter objecting to plaintiff's subpoena to the Doe defendants' internet service provider to learn the identity of the Doe defendants in this lawsuit. *See* dkt. 11.

On August 13, 2013, Chief Judge William M. Conley entered orders addressing these same issues in two similar cases: *Breaking Glass Pictures, LLC v. Does 1 - 15*, 13-cv-275 wmc (dkt. 12) and *TCYK, LLC v. Does 1- 13*, 13-cv-296 (dkt. 14). I agree with and adopt the court's reasoning and conclusions in those two orders. As a result, no Doe defendant is entitled to have plaintiff's subpoena to an ISP quashed, but each Doe defendant is entitled to have his/her identity sealed and maintained in confidence pending further order of this court in this case. This order applies to all Doe defendants in this lawsuit, including those who have not filed objections or motions to quash.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) To the extent that a Doe defendant has filed an objection that is intended to quash any subpoena issued by plaintiff to an internet service provider in this lawsuit, that motion is DENIED.
- (2) To the extent that this objection was intended to seek a protective order maintaining the confidentiality of a Doe defendant's identity, that motion is GRANTED.
- (3) The internet service providers who have been served subpoenas seeking the identity of Doe defendants in this lawsuit shall comply with these subpoenas on a confidential basis to plaintiff's counsel—on an attorney's eyes only basis for now—and to each Doe defendant separately and individually.
- (4) Plaintiff's attorneys are prohibited from disclosing any identifying information of any Doe defendant except in a document filed under seal with the court, unless plaintiff first obtains express leave from this court.

Entered this 19th day of August, 2013.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge